

REMARKS

The present amendment is in response to the Final Office Action dated September 6, 2006. Claim 28 is now present in this case and has been amended.

Applicant would like to request a telephone interview with the examiner to discuss this amendment and the remarks presented below.

Claim 28 stands rejected under both 35 U.S.C. § 101 and § 112 ¶1.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 101

With respect to the rejection of claim 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 101, the Office Action reasserts the same grounds for rejection related to lack of concreteness asserted in the previous Office Action dated March 21, 2006. In that Office Action, claim 28 was rejected for lacking concreteness because “no criteria or boundaries for relating the monetary contributions to the reputation building.” The Office Action also asked the question “what concrete, repeatable interpretation of the indicated monetary commentary data, which results from the method, is achieved by the invention?”

Claim 28 has been amended and no longer recites “building the reputation of the data inputting user-selected entity up or down.” However, applicant understands the rejection to be based on a lack of concreteness in the relationship between the monetary contributions and the monetary commentary. To clarify this relationship, claim 28 has been amended to recite that the monetary commentary is built by “performing statistical analysis upon the monetary contributions.” In other words, the monetary commentary is the result of a statistical analysis performed upon the monetary contributions; and to answer the question presented in the previous Office Action, the concrete, repeatable interpretation of the monetary commentary data is the result of the statistical analysis. The present Office Action acknowledges that the specification supports such statistical analysis. Because the statistical analysis produces a concrete result that is repeatable and predictable, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Claim Rejections -- 35 U.S.C. § 112 ¶1

The Office Action asserts claim 28 is not enabled “enough to produce a predictable and repeatable result when executed by one of ordinary skill in the art without undue experimentation.” As explained above, the statistical analysis relates the monetary contributions to the monetary commentary in a manner that is both predictable and repeatable. Therefore, applicant believes this ground for rejection has been overcome and the claim is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, reconsideration of the subject application and its allowance are kindly requested. The applicant has made a good faith effort to place all claims in condition for allowance. If questions remain regarding the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (206) 628-7739.

Respectfully submitted,

Anil K. Goyal

Davis Wright Tremaine LLP

/George C. Rondeau, Jr., Reg. #28893/

George C. Rondeau, Jr.

1501 Fourth Avenue
Suite 2600
Seattle, Washington 98101-1688
Phone: (206) 628-7739
Fax: (206) 903-3739

1900960_1.DOC